REMARKS

Because of the way in which the various groups are recited in the Office Action, it is not clear whether the restriction requirement is applicable to the pairs of the groups or to each group designated by a Roman numeral separately. In the event that the intention was to designate a pair of groups, applicant select groups I/II. In the event that only a single designated group was intended, applicants select group I.

In the event that the restriction requirement was intended to separate group I from group II, it is respectfully traversed. It is asserted that the subcombinations are separately useful but the second and third full paragraphs on page 2 of the Office Action identifies exactly the same feature (cutting through the first layer), as being the instance of separate usability. These paragraphs clearly do not identify a separate useable feature.

Reasons why Groups III through X are separate and distinct from each other and/or from Groups I and/or II have not been set forth. It is therefore respectfully submitted that the restriction requirement is improper and it is, for the record, respectfully traversed.

The Office Action alleges that the search required for each group is different and not co-extensive. Since the Office Action does not identify the search classes for any group, it is respectfully submitted that this statement of the reason for restriction is invalid. It is respectfully submitted that when the Examiner outlines the entire search for each of the various groups that it will be seen that the search is not so diverse as to justify restriction.

The early further consideration and allowance of this application is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Edward A. Meilman

Edward A. Meilman
Registration No.: 24,735
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN & OSHINSKY, LLP
1177 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036
Telephone: (212) 835-1400

EAM:hg

57563